



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/945,413 | 08/31/2001 | Mark A. George | NAIIP030/01.153.01 | 2725 |

29855 7590 09/12/2005

WONG, CABELLO, LUTSCH, RUTHERFORD & BRUCCULERI,
P.C.
20333 SH 249
SUITE 600
HOUSTON, TX 77070

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

COBY, FRANTZ

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2161

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/945,413

Applicant(s)

GEORGE ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz Coby

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _____ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

This is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on June 14, 2005 in which claims 1-3, 9-11, and 19-20 were amended and claims 21-43 were canceled.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guess et al. U.S. Patent no. 6,782,400 in view of Crozier U.S. Patent no. 5,701,423.

As per claim 1, Geuss et al. disclose "a method for importing data in a network-based customer relationship application, comprising "identifying data to be imported to a customer relationship application utilizing a network; identifying a set of predetermined rules associated with the customer relationship application; importing the data to the customer relationship application utilizing the network in accordance with the set of predetermined rules" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6., Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5-, Col. 3, lines 13-22., Col. 6, lines 9-54). In particular, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "storing the data in memory accessible to the customer relationship application" (See Geuss et al. Col. 4, lines 15-29', Col. 5, lines 3-8). Last, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein fields in which the data is stored in the memory are customizable by a user" by providing a configuration system that allows a user to designate precise configuration details to locate the data to be transferred (See Geuss et al. Figure 3., Col. 6, lines 23-27).

It is noted, however, Geuss did not specifically detail the claimed limitations of "mapping first fields for the data in the origin' to second fields for the destination and translating first field names of the mapped first fields to second field names of the

Art Unit: 2161

second fields and storing the imported data in memory at the destination accessible to the customer relationship application; wherein the mapping and translating are customizable by the user such that the second field names and the second fields in which the imported data is stored in the memory at the destination are customizable to the user” as recited in the instant claim 1. On the other hand, Crozier achieved the aforementioned claimed features by providing a method for mapping, translating and dynamically reconciling data between disparate computer platforms including mechanisms for the dynamic reconciliations of conflicts in the data based on both the content of the data and on specific preferences indicated by the user of the translation facility. In particular, the data is translated to a common format based on the user specified mapping of data fields (See Crozier Abstract; Col. 4, lines 48-67; Col. 5, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system Geuss et al. wherein the mechanism for data transferring provided thereof (See Geuss Figure 1 and corresponding text) would have incorporated the method for user specified mapping fields as taught by Crozier (See Crozier Figure 2 and corresponding text). The motivation being to enhance the versatility of Geuss’ et al. system by allowing it transfer and translate data more efficiently; thus, ensuring the integrity of the data imported to computer applications through the process of conflict resolution (See Crozier Col. 3, lines 28-30).

As per claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein a service application for importing the data is generated based on the rules" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6; Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5; Col.3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54).

As per claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the service application runs periodically at user-defined intervals" as import schedule rules that allows the data file to be imported according to a predetermined schedule 19 (See Guess et al. Col. 4, lines 9-12; Col. 7, lines 12-19)

As per claim 4, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the predetermined rules are specified based on user interaction with an application creation program" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6., Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5., Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54).

As per claim 5, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature "transforming the data" as translating the data (See Geuss et al. Col. 2, line 60-Col. 3, line 5).

As per claim 6, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 5. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 5 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the data is transformed based on user-created scripting functions" through the view of (figure 6 components 50) which allows users to designate a configuration (See Geuss et al. Col. 6, lines 23-47).

As per claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "exporting data from the customer relationship application utilizing the network" (See Geuss et al. Col. 2, lines 7-8).

o

As per claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the rules relate to at least one of referential integrity, required fields, and automatic sequence numbering"

(See Geuss et al. Figure 3, components 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72) are required fields related to the rules for generating a report.

As per claims 9-10, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Geuss et al. provides a computer program including logic for implementing all the limitations of claim 1 discussed above (See Geuss et al. Col. 5, lines 47-49).

As per claim 11, Geuss et al. disclose "a method for exporting data in a network-based customer relationship application, comprising 'identifying data to be exported from a customer relationship application utilizing a network, wherein the data is stored in memory accessible to the customer relationship application', identifying a set of predetermined rules associated with the customer relationship application, exporting the data from the customer relationship application utilizing the network in accordance with the set of predetermined rules" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 3, line 26). Also, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein fields in which the data is stored in the memory are customizable by a user" by providing a configuration system that allows a user to designate precise configuration details to locate the data to be transferred (See Geuss et al. Figure 3; Col. 6, lines 23-27).

It is noted, however, Geuss did not specifically detail the claimed limitations of "mapping first fields for the data in the origin' to second fields for the destination and translating first field names of the mapped first fields to second field names of the

Art Unit: 2161

second fields and storing the imported data in memory at the destination accessible to the customer relationship application; wherein the mapping and translating are customizable by the user such that the second field names and the second fields in which the imported data is stored in the memory at the destination are customizable to the user" as recited in the instant claim 11. On the other hand, Crozier achieved the aforementioned claimed features by providing a method for mapping, translating and dynamically reconciling data between disparate computer platforms including mechanisms for the dynamic reconciliations of conflicts in the data based on both the content of the data and on specific preferences indicated by the user of the translation facility. In particular, the data is translated to a common format based on the user specified mapping of data fields (See Crozier Abstract; Col. 4, lines 48-67; Col. 5, lines 1-9).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system Geuss et al. wherein the mechanism for data transferring provided thereof (See Geuss Figure 1 and corresponding text) would have incorporated the method for user specified mapping fields as taught by Crozier (See Crozier Figure 2 and corresponding text). The motivation being to enhance the versatility of Geuss' et al. system by allowing it transfer and translate data more efficiently; thus, ensuring the integrity of the data imported to computer applications through the process of conflict resolution (See Crozier Col. 3, lines 28-30).

As per claim 12, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of wherein a service application for exporting the data is generated based on the rules (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6., Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5, Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54).

As per claim 13, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 12 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the service application runs periodically at user-defined intervals as import schedule rules that allows the data file to be imported according to a predetermined schedule" (See Guess et al. Col. 7, lines 12-19; Col. 4, lines 9-12).

As per claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the predetermined rules are specified based on user interaction with a service application creation program" (See Geuss et al. Col. 1, line 58-Col. 2, line 6., Col. 2, lines 9-16, lines 20-33, lines 37-43, lines 47-55, line 60-Col. 3, line 5., Col. 3, lines 13-22; Col. 6, lines 9-54).

As per claim 15, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the data is transformed based on user-created scripting functions" through the view of (figure 6 components 50) which allows users to designate a configuration (See Geuss et al. Col. 6, lines 23-47).

As per claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 15. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 15 above. In addition, Geuss et al. disclose the claimed feature of "wherein the data is transformed based on user-created scripting functions" through the view of (figure 6 components 50) which allows users to designate a configuration (See Geuss et al. Col. 6, lines 23-47).

As per claim 17, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "exporting data from the customer relationship application utilizing the network" (See Geuss et al. Col. 2, lines 7- 8).

As per claim 18, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 11. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 11. In addition, Geuss et al. disclosed the claimed feature of "wherein the rules relate to at least one of referential integrity, required fields, and automatic sequence numbering"

(See Geuss et al. Figure 3, components 62, 64, 66, 68, 70 and 72) are required fields related to the rules for generating a report.

As per claims 19-20, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1 and 11 above. In addition, Geuss et al. provides a computer program including logic for implementing all the limitations of claim 1 discussed above (See Geuss et al. Col. 5, lines 47-49).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz Coby whose telephone number is 571 272 4017. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Saturday 3:00PM-10:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571 272 4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

September 5, 2005